

REMARKS

Claims 134-172 remain in the present application. Claims 134, 147 and 160 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on October 13, 2009 between Examiner Kevin Nguyen and Applicants' representative Bryan M. Failing. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on October 13, 2009 that the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejections and 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections would be withdrawn based on the amendments made herein to independent Claims 134, 147 and 160. No agreement was reached with respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection. Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 134-172 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on October 13, 2009 that the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejections would be withdrawn based on the amendments made herein to independent Claims 134, 147 and 160. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 134-172 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejections of record.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 134-172 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on October 13, 2009 that the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections would be withdrawn based on the amendments made herein to independent Claims 134, 147 and 160. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 134-172 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections of record.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 134-138, 140-151, 153-164 and 166-172

Claims 134-138, 140-151, 153-164 and 166-172 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 5,764,317 to Sadovnik et al. (referred to herein as “Sadovnik”) in view of United States Patent Number 5,694,150 to Sigona et al. (referred to herein as “Sigona”). Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 134-138, 140-151, 153-164 and 166-172 are not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Sigona for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 134 which recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

a multi-component display comprising:
a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,
wherein said first display screen is configured to display a visual indicator using said first plurality of pixels; and
a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels, wherein said first and second display screens overlap, and
wherein each of said first and second display screens is partially transparent; and

a user interface component comprising a user-selectable input component, wherein said user-selectable input component is configured to move said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane in response to a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component, and wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen.

Independent Claims 147 and 160 recite elements similar to independent Claim 134. Claims 135-138, 140-146, 148-151, 153-159, 161-164 and 166-172 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further elements of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sadovnik fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,” “a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels” and “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” as recited in independent Claim 134. As recited and described in the present application, a first display screen includes a first plurality of pixels. A second display screen includes a second plurality of pixels. Additionally, the first and second display screens overlap.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Sadovnik to teach volumetric screens which do not include pixels as claimed. For example, assuming arguendo that volumetric screens 160 of Sadovnik are analogous to first and second display screens as claimed, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Sadovnik that volumetric screens 160 include pixels as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Sadovnik fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “a first display screen comprising a

first plurality of pixels,” “a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels” and “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” as recited in independent Claim 134.

Further, although page 7 of the rejection suggests that Sadovnik teaches display screens with pixels as claimed, Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of Sadovnik describes that the throughput for volumetric screen controller 80 should be on the order of 400 Mbytes/sec to support an image resolution of 239x372 pixels and a volumetric screen with 50 layers (col. 7, lines 12-16). Applicants respectfully submit that an image resolution as taught by Sadovnik is very different from a display screen including a plurality of pixels as claimed since an image (or pixels of an image) as taught by Sadovnik is not a display screen (or pixels of a display screen) as claimed. As such, although Sadovnik may teach an image resolution of 239x372 pixels, Applicants reiterate that Sadovnik fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,” “a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels” and “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” as recited in independent Claim 134.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that Sigona, either alone or in combination with Sadovnik, fails to cure the deficiencies of Sadovnik discussed herein. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Sigona, either alone or in combination with Sadovnik, also fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,” “a second

display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels” and “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” as recited in independent Claim 134.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 134 is not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Sigona, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 147 and 160 recite elements similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 134, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 147 and 160 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since Claims 135-138, 140-146, 148-151, 153-159, 161-164 and 166-172 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 135-138, 140-146, 148-151, 153-159, 161-164 and 166-172 are also not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Sigona. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 134-138, 140-151, 153-164 and 166-172 are allowable.

Claims 139, 152 and 165

Claims 139, 152 and 165 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadovnik in view of Sigona and further in view of United States Patent Number 5,600,765 to Ando et al. (referred to herein as “Ando”). Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 139, 152 and 165 are not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Sigona and further in view of Ando for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ando, either alone or in combination with Sadovnik and/or Sigona, also fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,” “a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels” and “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” as recited in independent Claim 134, and similarly recited in independent Claims 147 and 160. Since Claims 139, 152 and 165 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 139, 152 and 165 are not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Sigona and further in view of Ando. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 139, 152 and 165 are allowable.

General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner’s rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 134-172 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 11 / 9 / 2009

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060